DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 309 633 FL 018 100

AUTHOR Austin, Theresa
TITLE Bilingual Teacher Attitudes and Language Use: A Comparison of Three Paraguayan Case Studies.
PUB DATE Mar 89
NOTE 35p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (San Francisco, CA, March 27-31, 1989).
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS *Bilingual Education; *Bilingual Teachers; Case Studies; *Classroom Communication; Comparative Analysis; Foreign Countries; Guarani; *Language Attitudes; Language of Instruction; Research Methodology; Second Language Learning; Spanish; Surveys; *Teacher Attitudes; Teacher Characteristics; Teaching Methods; Uncommonly Taught Languages
IDENTIFIERS *Paraguay

ABSTRACT

Data from three different teacher surveys are compared in a study of Paraguayan bilingual teacher attitudes on the choice of the language to be used in the classroom. The surveys were conducted in 1976, 1979, and 1986. Paraguay was chosen because of the stability of Guarani-Spanish bilingualism in that country and in its educational system. A secondary analysis was conducted on the survey data. The three surveys are described, and the results are compared and contrasted. These aspects of teacher attitudes are examined: (1) teacher characteristics and preparation; (2) instructional techniques; (3) teacher home language use; (4) teaching experience; (5) language use during recess and in meetings; (6) Guarani use in class during the course of the school year; (7) reasons for using Guarani; (8) attitudes toward Guarani as a subject matter; (9) attitudes toward Guarani as an informal language; (10) and the impact of Guarani use in teaching and on achievement. Results suggest growing positive attitudes about the instrumental use of Guarani, particularly orally, but show continued high esteem and preference for Spanish. Ambiguities reflect mixed teacher awareness of language use and choice. Issues in the methodology of survey comparisons are discussed, and potential areas for further research are suggested. (MSE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED309633

Paper presented at the Annual
Meeting of the American
Educational Research Association
(San Francisco, CA, March 27-31,
1989)

Bilingual Teacher Attitudes and Language Use: A comparison of three Paraguayan case studies

(DRAFT VERSION)

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Austin, T

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Theresa Austin

Graduate School of Education

University of California, L.A.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

FL018100

Introduction

Attention to bilingual teachers' attitudes toward the use of two languages and how these attitudes may affect input for students' language learning has not been sufficient. In educational research, it is acknowledged that teacher attitudes affect student achievement ("Pygmalion effect" as espoused by Rosenthal and Jacobson[1], or teacher expectation[2]). Also sociolinguistic studies are carried out to determine the attitudes toward accented or stigmatized dialects and have been able to test reactions to dialectal language variation (Labov[3], matched-guise techniques, Shuy[4]). However, in bilingual settings or second language educational settings, it is not widely known what teacher attitudes towards the use of the two languages are present. Although these attitudes are transmitted to the learners in the way teachers present the lessons and interact with the students, there has been scant research into the nature of these attitudes' impact on L2 input for student learning. In black dialect studies, some of the harshest critics of using BVE have been black educators who would not use BVE either orally or in writing and who dissuade their students from doing so. What are the attitudes of bilingual teachers toward the two languages in use in their classroom? How frequently are the two languages used by these teachers? Is there a relationship between attitudes and the frequency/amount of use of either language? These questions have lead to the following research comparing results of three case studies carried out in a bilingual environment in Latin America over the last ten years.

Secondary analysis was carried out on data collected from two different surveys conducted in 1976, and 1979. These are compared to a third study which was carried out by the author in 1986. Results are discussed in terms of trends that present themselves during this period across the three studies. Also discussed are the methodological issues in analyzing attitudinal research with survey data: "halo effect", consistency and variability of responses, validity of instruments.

Bilingual Teacher Attitudes and Language Use: A comparison of three Paraguayan case studies

1.0 Background on language attitude research: definition of language attitudes

There have been several aspects of 'language attitudes' defined: reactions to language use, language systems, or ratings on speech samples. Fishman (1975) offers the following broad definition of language attitudes: "evaluative reactions or feelings toward language use."[5] DeStefano (1978) puts forth another compatible view focusing not only on the use, but the value of the language itself: "sets of judgments that place relative values on the 'worth' of some languages or varieties."[6] Gynan[7] defines language attitude "as a learned predisposition to rate in a consistently favorable or unfavorable way a given speech sample", which suggests that attitude is an outcome of education.

Another perspective have been taken by applied linguistic studies. These identify attitudes as one of many constructs assembled under the label 'affective' variables in understanding second language learning by students.[8] In a recent study by Rodriguez-Brown (1987)[9] of college students learning Spanish, attitudes toward language, the second language, and the second language teacher are attributed more significance in second language learning than previously considered.

The many angles from which attitudes have been defined indicate the continued concern over an important elusive factor affecting language learning and use in education.A synthesis of the above perspectives was used in the current study's definition of attitudes: attitudes are a learned response to rate language samples, or systems, or the use of either.

1.1 Background on language attitude research: methods of measuring attitudes

Though Acton (1984)[10] warns that common sense notions of attitudes are difficult to measure or suffer from conceptual overlap, four types of instruments have been commonly used in attitudinal research: a semantic differential scale, close-ended questionnaire, matched-guise technique, and interviews. The semantic differential scale requires the respondent to react to specific statements by selecting one of a pair of opposite adjectives which represent the respondent's opinion. Also, the scale could be in the form of a judgmental continuum, i.e. strongly agree to strongly disagree. Various manipulations of this continuum have been carried out to get the 'latitude of linguistic attitudes[11]' or a measure of rater's ideal values versus what the rater reports to be the case. The next instrument often used is a close-ended questionnaire, which has the rater indicate a response from a number of alternatives, eg. yes/no/do not know response. The matched-guise technique is highly touted as an instrument that is only sensitive to linguistic features. With this technique, raters must react to speakers who

display certain features characteristic of the group under study. Speakers provide tape-recorded versions of each of their speech styles. Unknown to the raters, the samples they hear belong to the same speaker. Therefore, the raters assume that they are reacting to two different speakers rather than the same speaker having various speech samples. Interviews have been used to get raters to judge themselves by picking a number of adjectives that best describes them from a check list, or to complete open-ended questions regarding the value, appropriateness, etc. of a language sample. Each of these methods has drawbacks and advantages in tapping the illusive "language attitudes". However, in the following sections, the use of a language attitude survey in South America will be discussed in terms of the trends presented across a span of ten years and the difficulties in analyzing attitudinal data from survey research.

1.2 Background on language attitude research: areas of language attitude research

One area in which the instruments mentioned above have been used is to measure student-held attitudes that have affected the type and rate of L2 acquisition. These attitudes have been categorized as integrative/instrumental, sentimental/functional, positive and negative.

Another area in which these instruments have been used has been to measure how people react to language variation, standard versus dialect, vernacular[12], accented or morphological and syntactically varied speech, monolingualism versus bilingualism or multilingualism.

One population's attitudes toward language, in particular, has drawn educational researchers' attention: that of teachers. Most of the research on teacher's attitudes toward language use, and language systems in general, has been in the area of the educational implications of teacher reaction to students' use of non-standard varieties. Attitudes rejecting the use of Black Vernacular English have been expressed in the past (See Hall and Freedle, 1975[13]) as well as those supporting its use in dialect readers (See Stewart, 1964[14]) Studies have measured the consequences of teacher-held linguistic attitudes to demonstrate how these affect reading achievement of students using non-standard language, teacher expectations of these students[15], lower assessment of pupil's language abilities and performance, and self-esteem of the speakers. Although earlier research on teacher attitudes impacting on linguistically different students' educational achievement had clearly been established, the issue finally came to national attention via a landmark case in the late '70's. The US. district court decision in Martin Luther King, Jr. Elementary School Children v. Ann Arbor School District Board pointed out that the non-standard language was in itself not the barrier causing the children's failure to learn to read, rather the negative attitudes toward this language variation held by the teachers.

Combining these with earlier findings of Rosenthal and Jacobson (1968)[16], Good and Brophy (1973)[17], Good (1981)[18], which focus on the self-fulfilling prophecy in the classroom, concerned educators had ample reason to initiate intervention in changing teachers' negative attitudes toward non-standard varieties[19].
However, there is an area that remains as fertile ground for research on teacher language attitudes, that is how these affect the amount and quality of L2 exposure. Cazden (1988)[20] restates the critical function of language in a classroom as

> ...the language of curriculum, the language of control, and the language of personal identity- the tripartite core of all categorizations of language functions:
> - The communication of propositional information (also termed the referential, cognitive,or ideational function)
> - The establishment and maintenance of social relationships.
> - The expression of the speaker's identity and attitudes.
>
> (p. 3)

Thus language use is indirectly identified as a reflection of attitudes held by the speaker. Additionally, in bilingual classrooms, teacher language use is critical not only as a model for communication, but as a source of linguistic input, and a transmitter of curriculum to L2 learners. Therefore, it is important to examine attitudes toward the use of two languages in the classroom, as they may well affect the type and amount of exposure to each language that a pupil receives.

Bruck and Shultz (1977)[21] showed how the language dominance of the U.S. bilingual teacher affected the language use patterns in the bilingual classroom in terms of the total amount and the ways each language was used. In a later study by Bruck, et al. (1979)[22] the researchers attributed infrequent student use of L1 to teacher language preferences. This trend seems to replicate results of attitudes of held by Black educators who are against the use of BVE. If this trend continues, we could very well end up with monolingual, and monodilectal language use patterns in the classroom.

Herein lies the importance of the questions: What are bilingual teacher's views on the use of two languages in the class? Are teachers' attitudes toward teacher language use and choice influencing their linguistic behavior in the classroom?

2.0 Bilingual teacher attitudes and language use: Paraguay

This paper, primarily expository in nature, introduces the unique bilingual situation in Paraguay as a beginning point for the examination of survey research on teacher attitudes toward the roles of two languages in the classroom. It is my intent to stimulate questions about the relation of teacher attitudes and teacher linguistic behavior in bilingual classrooms which may impact upon input made available to L2 learners.

2.1 Bilingual teacher attitudes and language use: Why Paraguay?

There are many reasons for choosing Paraguay as a site for research on language attitudes held by teachers. It can be considered, until recently, as a politically very stable country, having almost thirty-five years of rule by a single dictator. Although at a slower pace than any of its more industrialized neighbors, socioeconomic development has been steadily improving[23] and allowing for increased social mobility. Cooperation with international agencies allowed for dramatic increases in the number of schools built from the 50's till the present time

Despite the influx of Chinese and Korean immigrants, and the existence of several nuclei of German and Japanese populations, immigration has not significantly altered the relatively homogeneous linguistic character of the nation. In addition, the very small numbers of isolated aboriginal groups, totaling less than 1%, leave Paraguay's ethnic homogeneity intact.

The country has maintained a uniquely stable national bilingual tradition which has endured several centuries. Spanish and Guaraní are recognized as the official languages of Paraguay[24]. Although Spanish is more cultivated than Guaraní, several Guaraní language training institutions exist. Guaraní radio programs, theater, night clubs, newspaper articles, journals, song books and a growing body of literature also exist and flourish along with their Spanish counterparts. Major institutional support occurred in 1977, when the principle teacher training institute, el Instituto Superior de Education began training teachers to deal with the bilingual nature of the country, and to upgrade the value of Guaraní in educational settings[25]. Also the late 70's and early 80's witnessed successful experimentation with bilingual education[26], resulting in nationalization of the project in 1983. To this date, in-service activities are still being carried out by bilingual education teams to help teachers already in service to teach Guaraní monolingual students. Guaraní is a required subject in secondary schools and is taught at the university level as well. Currently, experimentation with mother tongue literacy is being carried out in the capital.

At the individual level as well, there is great pride in taken in being bilingual.

Empirical research findings on Paraguay's situation are neither abundant, readily accessible, nor frequently presented in English. Indeed, it is a little known bilingual education success story whose scrutiny may be lead to valuable revelations about bilinguals and their education.

2.2 The three studies- OAS, Verón, and Austin

Data in this paper were selected from three different teacher surveys conducted in 1976, 1979, and 1986. These appear to be the only empirically substantiated research on teacher attitudes toward the use of two languages in the classroom and teacher reported language use. Due to the small numbers of respondents involved, no inferential statistical analyses could be carried out on any of the results of the surveys. Instead, secondary analysis of the two earlier studies' reported results on several issues are presented in percentages of response and contrasted by the year of each survey. For comparability, the third study's results were treated in the same manner.

2.2.1 OAS Study

The first survey was conducted under the auspices of the Organization of American States and in collaboration with the Paraguayan Ministry of Education[27]. Four departments were included in the study to obtain a sample of the bilingual abilities of the first grader and to describe some of the characteristics related to these abilities and academic achievement.

Variables that were examined were achievement, linguistic competence, socioeconomic background, urban/rural distinctions, characteristics of the teacher, opinions of the teacher and parent, and the oral interaction between teacher and student in the classroom, as measured by Flanders' classroom observation checklist. This study selected a stratified sample of twenty schools from each of the four departments that met these criteria: having an average of twenty students each between the ages of 7 and 9; schools offering a 1-6 grades at one site, having certificated teachers; and implementing the educational directives from the year 1956[28], which was the plan prior to the then current 1973[29] plan; and conforming to a convenient urban/rural distinction[30]. Yet, given the small numbers of schools in the areas chosen, and the even smaller number of schools that met all the criteria, the study reports having to collapse two categories of rural representation into one. After getting the established number of classrooms, twenty students that were to be tested were randomly chosen according to the following criteria: being between the ages of 7-9, and not having repeated any grades.

The first grade teachers included in the OAS study had been certificated under criteria which was different from those in subsequent years. In 1937, the teacher qualifications for obtaining a teaching credential 'maestro normal' was 5 years beyond a primary

school education. While for the title of 'profesor normal' two years of additional study were required. In 1956, three years beyond the ninth grade (ciclo básico) were necessary for the credential 'profesor de Educación Primaria'. Finally, in 1973 high school graduation and two years of teacher training were necessary for obtaining an elementary school teaching credential, while an additional two years were required for high school teaching credentials. Nonetheless, all had to be certificated to be included in the OAS survey.

For comparison with two subsequent case studies, I refer to only selected results from the OAS teacher survey, and specifically those results from one particular rural area, Paraguarí. In the two later studies, similar forms of the OAS questionnaire were used to identify the background of the teacher, the use frequency and patterns of Guaraní as a language of instruction, the reasons for these patterns and frequency, and a global reaction to the perceived pedagogic efficiency of using Guaraní.

Cited in the following sections are the results selected from the OAS study that deal solely with 20 first grade teachers located in Paraguarí, the same site in which the third study was conducted. The OAS teachers came from 5 classrooms located in the capital of the department, 5 classrooms located in the capital of the district, and 10 classrooms located in the countryside. Furthermore, all teachers, from the portion of the OAS study on which I am reporting, taught in a predominately agricultural area.

2.2.2 Verón Study

The second study was a 1981 doctoral dissertation[31] filed at René Descartes University, in Sorbonne, France. It was later published in Sociedad y Lengua:Bilingüismo en el Paraguay, by Centro Paraguayo de Estudios Sociológicos in 1982. This study was conducted by Victoria Verón and titled in the Spanish version: El niño rural de primer grado en una situación de bilinguismo[32]. Verón's research question set out to test whether or not there was a positive relationship between the repression of the mother tongue and student failure.

In contrast with OAS' four-department study, Verón drew a sample from only one department, Caraguatay and bordering areas in the department of Cordillera. From this predominately rural department, twenty schools were chosen to participate based on the following criteria of: using the educational plan 1956, and belonging to a rural/urban category previously described[33]. In contrast with the OAS study, Verón did not require that the school site have a complete 1-6th grade curriculum[34], average numbers of students, or for the teachers to be certificated.

While the OAS study's selected only first grade teachers, the Verón study surveyed all the teachers in the 20 schools selected.

Although only dealing with 87 teachers from various grade levels in rural schools in a distinct research site, Verón provides another view of rural Paraguayan educators and their language use.

Similar to the OAS study, Verón used Flanders' classroom interaction analysis checklist, as well as a teacher questionnaire, and a student reading test. The items[35] on the questionnaire dealt with a wider range of issues which gave a more detailed teacher perspective than presented in the OAS study. Since not all of these items were included in the OAS study, only those common to either the OAS or the Austin studies are included for discussion in this paper.

2.2.3 Austin Study

The third study was conducted in Paraguay as part of the author's own 1985-87 dissertation research project[36]. Due to a number of constraints, only one school was selected from one of the departments included in the OAS study. Characterized by a "successful"[37] bilingual program following the 1973 Curricular Plan, this school had previously participated in the experimental bilingual project, and had gone on record as having adopted the bilingual teaching techniques promoted by the Ministry of Education. All eight teachers from grades 1-4 were credentialed.

In this third study, a questionnaire was used to elicit teacher attitudes and language use. As it was intended to be comparable with earlier findings, the format was a modified version of the previous two studies' survey instrument. This survey was carried out after ethnographic observation had been completed for the school year. Each instructor was approached individually at their home or a convenient meeting place by the same research assistant who had been in their classes throughout the year. They were given the questionnaire to complete and could take as long as was desired to fill it out. The research assistant was instructed to speak only in Guaraní, and to clarify all questions about the survey in Guaraní.

In addition to providing opinions about the distribution of language use during the course of the year, the survey also revealed the preparation and experience each instructor had in the profession, in the particular grade level, and at the particular school site. Furthermore, teachers were given the opportunity to discuss any possible effects that presence of the research team and equipment had on the children in each class and the instructors.

3.0 General similarities and differences between the three studies

All three studies involved use of similar survey instruments to examine the attitudes and language use patterns of teachers in similar settings. The differences in implementation are not clear due to the lack of technical information published on the OAS and

Verón studies. Therefore, details about the length of time over which this information was collected, the amount of time used to complete the survey, the identity of the data collectors and their selection process, the language and place in which each were administered, and other relevant background data on implementation are not accessible. The overall questionnaire response rate for OAS and Austin studies was high (100% of those selected to participate, participated[38]); yet the response rate and exact numbers of responses for Veron's study was omitted from the report[39]. Hence, the instrument itself, the general area in which it was used, and the populations for which it was used, are the only constants.

As the educational system had two different curricula in use, the OAS and Verón studies involved schools implementing the 1956 plan, while the Austin study dealt with a school using the 1973 plan. All three studies included observational data; the OAS and Verón studies used the Flanders system over a few days of observation, while Austin used ethnographic methods for one year.

In the sections that follow, the findings on teacher characteristics, reported language use and attitudes towards this use will be discussed.

3.1 Results compared and contrasted: Teacher characteristics

The factors dealing with teacher characteristics reveal the technical and professional qualities about teachers included in the three studies. In particular, the professional training, the years of teaching experience, and home language use are presented.

3.2 Results compared and contrasted: Teacher Preparation (Language instruction training)

Of interest to the OAS study was whether or not the instructor had received training in teaching language[40]. The majority (55%, N=11) claimed that they had not, while 45% (N= 9) declared that they had. In the Verón study, the question was phrased differently. It asked whether or not the teachers received an orientation on the problems of bilingualism during their formal preparation as teachers. Among those that answered, 53% (N=46.11?) claimed not to have received any training, 36% (N=31.32?) claimed to have received a little, and 9% (N=7.83?) claimed they were trained after they had already started teaching. The Austin study demonstrated a greater majority had received training (75%, N= 6), while only 25% (N=2) had not.

So it appears that in ten years, gradually more and more teachers received training in language instruction. The increase in teacher education with respect to language teaching can be directly attributed to the efforts of the bilingual education project. This project, which started in 1981, continues to promote both in-service and pre-service language training for Paraguayan bilingual education teachers.

3.3 Results compared and contrasted: Techniques

When asked whether they put into practice the training they had received [41], in the OAS study 45% (N=9) claimed that they did, 40% (N=8) claimed they did not and 15% (N=3) did not respond[42].
In the Verón study, there is only a footnote[43] that refers to the instructional practices of rural teachers. In essence, it stated that the majority of rural teachers had not had any formal training to rely on. Therefore, Verón claimed that most intuitively helped their students, and that training to deal with the bilingual nature of the students was needed.

Rather than trying to ascertain whether teachers report putting to use the techniques that they were taught[24], in Austin's study the teachers were asked to name the techniques that they used (question #2): 87.5% (N=7) mentioned "introduction to dialogue", 75% (N=6) indicated "directed conversation", 50% (N=4) declared "open conversation", 37.5% (N=3) answered "substitution" and "placement testing", 25% (N=2) indicated "observation" and 12.5% (N=1) mentioned "second language methods", "situational examples", "group work", "individual work" and "more Spanish than Guaraní". By providing the techniques they employed, the teachers revealed the terminology used in their own training, thus dating themselves. The three techniques most often mentioned were those utilized in the bilingual training programs offered by the Ministry. The next two most cited techniques, "substitution" and "placement testing" were also techniques introduced in these bilingual training courses. This question reveals the teacher's ability to identify techniques that are currently used in the bilingual education training program. Furthermore, it indicates that over 50% are familiar with only a minor part of the techniques used in bilingual education.

3.4 Results compared and contrasted: Teacher Home Language Use

In terms of the language use at home[33], in the OAS study only 5% (N=1) claimed to use Spanish at home, while 95% (N=19) claimed to use both. In the Verón study, only 59% (N=51.33?) claimed to use both languages; while 29% (N=25.23?) reported use of Spanish and 12% (N=10.44?) reported use of Guaraní. After this dramatic reduction of reported bilingualism and high reports of Spanish usage versus Guaraní, Austin's study found that 100% (N=8) reported use of both languages at home.

Despite demonstrating fluctuation in levels of reported bilingualism from the first study to the latest study, the three studies consistently show over 50% claiming use of the two languages. At the same time, lower levels of reported Guaraní monolingualism prevails across all the studies.

3.5 Results compared and contrasted:Teaching experience (total

number of years)

According to the OAS study, the average number of years of teaching experience was eight years, five months. In the Verón study, no average was calculated, rather teachers were divided into two groups, one of which 46.4% had more than 11 years of experience, while the remaining 53% had less than 10 years of experience. In the Austin study, 62.5% (5) had less than 10 years experience, only 25% (2) had more than 10 years of experience and 12.5% (1) did not answer. The results of the Austin study indicated that the average number of years of service for the eight instructors queried was 10;5 months.

4.0 Results compared and contrasted: Reported Language Use

In this section, information is reported on the teacher's selection and/or frequency of use of Spanish and Guaraní in various school settings.

4.1 Results compared and contrasted: Guaraní / Spanish use during recess

Only two of the studies reported on the frequency of each language's use during a usually informal period of the school schedule: recess. In the Verón study, the question regarding language use during recess was replaced by more specific questions. For this reason, Verón's results will be discussed in the section following this one.

During recess, in the OAS study, 60% (N=12) of the teachers reported using Guaraní frequently, and 40% (N=8) infrequently. On the other hand, 90% (N=18) reported frequent use of Spanish during recess, and 10% (N=2) reported infrequent use.[34] Assuming that no one would report infrequent use of both languages, this seems to reveal that Spanish and Guaraní are used frequently by 50% (N=10), 40% (N=8) used Spanish more frequently than Guaraní, and that 10% (N=2) preferred the use of Guaraní over Spanish.

In the Austin study, the assumption that no one could report infrequent use of either language proved false: 75% (N=6) claimed infrequent use of Spanish and 62.5% (N=5) claimed infrequent use of Guaraní. Also 25% (N=2) claimed to use Spanish frequently during recess; as well, 25% (N=2) claimed to use Guaraní frequently Spanish during the same period. A closer examination of the responses to see whether or not these groups were mutually exclusive was necessary. Of the 75% (N=6) who responded with infrequent use of Spanish only 1/3 (N=2) claimed to make frequent use of Guaraní during recess. The other 2/3 (N=4) claimed to make infrequent use of Guaraní. The 25% which claimed frequent use of Spanish claimed infrequent use of Guaraní, and the 25% claiming frequent use of Guaraní claimed infrequent use of Spanish. Thus, the assumption that because the percentages were the same, that the groupings would be mutually exclusive is incorrect. Without access

to the original data, the percentages in the OAS, and Verón could also be potentially misleading in this same way. Austin's study presents a very confusing picture of the language use during recess. Either 50 % of the entire total of eight teachers infrequently speak in either language during the recess (infrequently using either Spanish or Guaraní), and let the remaining 50% speaking either in Guaraní or in Spanish, or the self-report was not an accurate measure of which language was predominately used during the recess. It is curious to note that the teachers who reported speaking Spanish frequently worked together during the same morning shift, which had traditionally higher female student populations; while those that reported speaking Guaraní worked together during the afternoon shift, which had higher percentages of male students.

4.2 Results compared and contrasted: Guaraní / Spanish use in meetings

Each of the three studies approached the issue of variation of language use according to setting in different manners. The OAS identified only one type of meeting for which two separate questions asked the use frequency of each of the two languages. The Veron study asked the respondents to select the language used in three separate interactions: with the principal, with teachers, and with parents. The Austin study asked for language use frequencies for each of the two languages in two different settings: meetings with parents, and meetings with teachers.
In the OAS study, teachers were asked about their use of Spanish and Guaraní during meetings in general. Furthermore, the OAS study considered these meetings a formal situation[35]. Teacher use of Spanish for didactic communication during meetings was reported in the following manner: 90% (N=18) declared frequent use of Spanish, 5% (N=1) infrequent use of Spanish and 5% (N=1) never used Spanish, whereas 55% (N=11) claimed frequent use of Guaraní, and 45% (N=9) claimed infrequent use of Guaraní.

Verón's report did not deal with frequency of use, rather with selection of languages according to audience. The reports of teacher language choice with students' parents showed a lower percentage admitting use of Spanish only (5%, N=4.35?). Not surprisingly, 49% (N=42.63?) claimed to use Guaraní only, and 45% (N=39.15?) both languages. Only 1% did not respond to this question.

A sharp contrast is seen when the Verón teachers reported on language used among themselves. The majority (54%, N=46.98?) claimed to use both languages, 43% (N=37.41?) Spanish, and only 2% (N=1.74?) Guaraní, leaving 1% (N=.87?) that did not respond. A possible explanation that can be offered is that teacher-to-teacher talk was most often viewed as "formal" by the respondent. If this were the case, then one is left with the impression that 43% of the

teachers were inclined to report using both languages, and next report only Spanish rather than Guaraní among themselves[36].

Verón's results also revealed that with the principal, 69% (N=60.03?) claimed to use Guaraní, 25% (N=21.75?) both languages, 1% (N=.87?) Spanish and 5% (N=4.35?) did not respond.
If one were to view speaking with the principal as a formal situation, the overwhelming support for the use of Guaraní alone is unusual when compared to the OAS study, in which "formal" meant the frequent use of Spanish by 90% (N=18) during meetings. The other possible explanation is that teachers viewed talk with the principal as an informal situation, thus using Guaraní with higher frequency than Spanish.

In the Austin study, language use during teacher and parent meetings were separate categories. Austin's study shows 100% (n=8) report use of Spanish frequently in teacher meetings (question #7) and 87.5% (N=7) indicate use of Spanish infrequently in meetings with parents(question #6), leaving only 12.5% (N=1) claiming frequent use of Spanish with the parents.

On the use of Guaraní in teacher meetings (question #11), teachers reported unanimously (100%, N=8) that Guaraní was used infrequently. However, when reporting on the use of Guaraní during meetings with parents (question #10), the teachers were divided evenly into those that claimed to rarely use Guaraní (50%, N=4) and those that frequently use it (50%,N=4). All the teachers who claimed to frequently use Guaraní with the parents claimed to use Spanish infrequently. However, 3 out of the 4 that claimed infrequent use of Guaraní, also claimed infrequent use of Spanish. Unless this is interpreted as having little contact with the parents in either language, it is untenable that both languages are used infrequently. It appears that teachers in the Austin study were reluctant to admit to using Guaraní during parent meetings; however firmly declared that they infrequently used Spanish.

Two studies indicated that with the students' parents, the teachers were in agreement as to the use of Guaraní or Guaraní and Spanish together. All three studies also show high numbers supporting the use of Spanish during teacher meetings with teachers, and secondary support for the use of both languages in teacher/teacher meetings. However, the role played by Guaraní was not clearly defined in formal situations, as was seen in the percentage variation depending on how "formal" was defined.

4.3 Results compared and contrasted: Use of Spanish in class.

The three studies focused primarily on the use of Guaraní in the school setting. Hence, very few questions dealt with the use of Spanish.

The OAS study contained only one question with respect to the use

of Spanish in the classroom[37] compared to the multitude of questions asked about Guaraní, which asked about the use of Guaraní as medium of instruction in general (#37), frequency during the year (#38 a-c and #39), attitudes towards its use in specific subject areas (#45 a-f7), and attitudes toward Guaraní as a medium of instruction (#41). The report indicated that 95% (N=19) claimed to use Spanish frequently in teaching, and only 5% (N=1) claimed to use it infrequently. Comparing this to those who reported their use of Guaraní as frequent[38] (55%,N=11), we can deduce that both languages must have been used frequently by 50% (N=10) of the people. Of those who claimed to use Guaraní infrequently 45% (N=9), we may deduce that they all used Spanish frequently. And only 5% (N=1) is an infrequent user of Spanish but frequent user of Guaraní. These deductions hold if we assume that no one can be infrequent users of both languages.

In Verón's study, teachers were not asked about the frequency of use of either language rather on which was used in the class. This showed that 80% of the teachers claimed to use Spanish and Guaraní in the class with the students, compared with 16% claiming to use only Spanish, 1% only Guaraní, and 2% abstaining from responding. There is no mention of what happened to the remaining 1% that went unreported.

In the Austin study, the results show a majority reported using Spanish frequently (62.5%, N=5), however those that claimed to use it infrequently constituted 37.5% (N=3). When the results of the Guarani usage in the classroom (question #8) are compared to the results gained from this question, a conflict in reported use is found. Although one instructor reported using both languages frequently (12.5%), which is quite possible, two other instructors claimed to use both languages infrequently (25%), which is impossible. One teacher showed frequent use of Guaraní and infrequent use of Spanish (12.5%), while 4 (50%) expressed frequent use of Spanish and infrequent use of Guaraní. However, in reporting Guaraní use for the whole year, all claimed to have used it infrequently, in question #15, placing in doubt the two reports of frequent use of Guaraní (25%, N=2). It is apparent that teachers in this study were very reluctant to admit to frequent use of Guaraní.

4.4 Results compared and contrasted:Use of Guaraní during year In class (unspecified)

The use of Guaraní during the course of the year was the next topic surveyed. In the OAS study, the responses to the question asking about the use of Guaraní at the beginning, middle and end of the year[39] showed a marked decrease in those reporting frequent use as the year came to a close, (85%, N=17; 35%, N=7; and 30%, N=6 respectively). Also, as to be expected, the teachers who reported infrequent use of Guaraní increased from 15% (N=3) at the

beginning, to 50% (N=10) at mid-point and stayed at 50% (N=10) for the end of the school year. It is interesting to note that at the beginning of the school year, everyone reported the use of Guaraní and towards the middle point, 10% (N=2) claimed to have quit using Guaraní at all, which continued to hold true till the end of the year. In addition, another 5% (N=1) did not declare their mid-school year use of Guaraní; this number doubling to 10% (N=2) at the end of the year. The over-all effect of these results indicate a solid trend of decreased reports of Guaraní use as the year progressed. Furthermore, when these same teachers were asked to indicate the amount of Guaraní used during the whole year[40], 55% (N=11) claimed to have used Guaraní frequently, 35% (N=7) infrequently, and 10% (N=2) did not respond. The discussion of this response in the report itself unfortunately does not try to determine which percentages correspond to which group of users of Guaraní at different points in the year. Therefore, the general impression obtained is that Guaraní is reported as used frequently throughout the year, however is also reported to taper off by the end of the year.

Verón posed the question in a graph form, forcing the teachers to select periods during the year in which they used Guaraní frequently, infrequently or never. The periods were the same periods used in the OAS and the Austin studies. Those that reported frequent use of Guaraní did so at the beginning of the year which totaled 45% (N=39.15?), and throughout the year at 54% (N=46.98?). Those that claimed infrequent use did so at the midpoint with 54% (N= 46) and at the end with 46% (N=40.02). No one claimed to have "never" used Guaraní in the classroom. In the Austin study, responses concerning amount of Guaraní use at various points during the year (questions #12, 13, 14) did conform to the results produced in by OAS; however the trend seen was more dramatic in the Austin study. At the beginning of the year, 37.5% (N=3) of the teachers claimed to use Guaraní infrequently, while the other 63.5% (N=5) declared frequent use. At the mid and final points in the year, the teachers were in complete agreement over their infrequent use of Guaraní. When the question regarding the amount of Guaraní used over the entire year was posed, it received a resounding unanimous response of "infrequently used" (question #15). This may confirm that even those that reported using Guaraní frequently in the beginning of the year tapered off their usage toward the end of the year to the extent that overall they felt they had used Guaraní infrequently. Another possible explanation of this response, is due to some perceived need to admit only to infrequent use of Guaraní.

The results of all three studies point to decrease in reporting frequency of Guaraní use from the middle to the end of the year, and a clear majority using Guaraní frequently throughout the year.

4.5 Results compared and contrasted: In classroom as language of instruction

Although it is doubtful that the teachers understood the implications of the OAS question #37 (medium of instruction v.s. disciplinary language v.s. classroom management, etc), the results coincide with just a slight variation to those responses tapped by question #39 (use of Guaraní during the year). In both questions, 55% (N=11), answered that they used Guaraní frequently. The variation occurred among those who claimed infrequent use of Guaraní. For the question on Guaraní as a medium of instruction, only 45% (N=9) declared infrequent use of Guaraní, while as 35% (N=7) declared infrequent use of Guaraní throughout the year and 10% (N=2) did not answer the question. It appears that in the OAS study, the majority of the teachers frequently used Guaraní for instructional purposes, yet 10% (N=2) wobbled in declaring how often.

Rather than including a question in the teacher survey on the use of Guaraní as a medium of instruction, the Verón study asked merely for frequencies of Guaraní use in the classroom.

In the Austin study, (question #8), only 25% (N=2) claimed to use Guaraní frequently as a medium of instruction. The other 75% (N=6) claimed infrequent use of Guaraní. When these results are viewed in light of those obtained from the question on overall Guaraní use during the year (question #15), there is a puzzling discrepancy. The 25% (N=2) who claimed to use Guaraní in general 'frequently' as a medium of instruction reversed their claims for total year Guaraní language use by claiming that they infrequently used Guaraní during the year period. This could be interpreted as frequent sporadic use of Guaraní for didactic communication but in terms of the whole year's language use, infrequent use of Guaraní. Another possible explanation of this discrepancy is that teachers were for some reason did not want to admit to using Guaraní frequently throughout the whole year.

4.6 Results compared and contrasted: Explanation of use of Guaraní

Over half of the teachers consulted by the OAS study (55%, N=11) claimed to use Guaraní because they found it necessary[41]. Another 45% (N=9) claimed to use it because it was convenient.

The Verón study presents the highest percentage to affirm the use of Guaraní as necessary[42] with 75% (N=62.5?) claiming accordingly. In this study, the remaining reports were distributed in the following manner: 18.3% (N=15.92?) because it was convenient, and 7% (N=6.09?) did not respond.

In the Austin study (question #16), 37.5% (N=3) claimed to use Guaraní because of the convenience; while the rest (63.5%, N=5) claimed to use it out of necessity.

It is noteworthy that despite the available option, no one in any

of the three studies chose to justify the use of Guaraní due to liking the language. These studies demonstrate an overall increase through the years (from 55% to 75% to 63.5%) in the opinion that the vast majority view necessity as the reason for their use of Guaraní. Language loyalty due to sentimental reasons or preference did not seem to be a factor at all in Guaraní use in the classroom.

5.0 Results compared and contrasted: Attitude towards the use of Guaraní according to subject matter

Only two studies examined attitudes toward the use of Guaraní in teaching various subject matter: OAS and Austin.

In the OAS study, only schools using the Ministry of Education's 1956 curriculum design were included. Thus, the exact subject matter differs slightly from that of the school in which Austin's study took place, in which the curriculum plan of 1976 was being used. In oral language[43], 65% (N=13) expressed favorable attitudes toward the use of Guaraní, 20% (N=4) unfavorable, and 15% (N=3) indifferent. However, when the use of Guaraní in the realm of teaching reading and writing was asked, the response was solidly unfavorable. For reading[44], 30% (N=6) were in favor, 45% (N=9) opposed, and 25% (N=5) indifferent. For writing[45], only 15% (N=3) were in favor, 70% (N=14) opposed and 15% (N=3) indifferent. This reaction could be due to the teachers' lack of familiarity with reading and writing in Guaraní.

When asked to express their opinions on the use of Guaraní in teaching arithmetic[46], 55% (N=11) expressed favorable opinions, 20% (N=4) opposed the idea and 25% were indifferent. However when discussing natural sciences[47], social studies[48] and hygiene[49], the majority were favorably inclined. For natural sciences and social studies alike, 65% (N=13) were in favor, 15% (N=3) opposed, and 20% (N=4) indifferent; for hygiene, an astounding 70% (N=14) were in favor of using Guaraní, leaving the opposition and indifferent opinions evenly distributed with 15% (N=3) each. Furthermore, when the question of Guaraní use as a medium of instruction was posed in a general format[50], 65% (N=13) expressed positive reactions towards the use of Guaraní, 15% (N=3) negative and 20% (N=20) indifferent. Thus, overall the responses confirm a favorable reaction to the use of Guaraní in all the subject areas, except reading and writing.

Likewise, in the Austin study the majority of the teachers held favorable attitudes towards using Guaraní as a medium of instruction in every subject matter. For the subjects of communication, and social studies the results were divided into three groups: teachers who thought it was a good idea (62.5%), teachers who were indifferent (25%) and a teacher who was opposed (12.5%). Since reading and writing were not separate categories,

rather joint under the title communication, more negative responses may not have been tapped. For mathematics and science, 37.5% (N=3) expressed that it did not matter whether or not Guaraní were used. In contrast, 62.5% (N=5) claimed it was a good idea to use Guaraní for mathematics, and 50% (N=4) claimed it was a good idea to use Guaraní for science. There was a 12.5% (N=12.5) "no response" to the use of Guaraní in science. For the subjects of health, work, and natural sciences, the opinion of the instructors was evenly divided: 50% (N=4) saying it did not matter, and 50% (N=4) claiming it was a good idea. When the teachers in the Austin study were asked in general terms what was their reaction to the use of Guaraní as a medium of instruction (question #17), the results were similar to the OAS study: 62.5 (N= 5) percent were in favor, 12.5% (N=1) opposed and 25% (N=2) indifferent.

Summarizing then, in both studies teachers were favorably inclined toward using Guaraní in all the discipline areas, despite their reports of infrequently using Guaraní as a language of instruction (question #8), and infrequently using Guaraní during the school year (question #15).

5.1 Results compared and contrasted:Attitudes toward Guaraní as an informal language

Similar to the trend in attitudes expressed in relation to the use of Guaraní as a medium of instruction, the attitudes expressed in the OAS study towards the use of Guaraní as an informal language in school[51] were largely positive (65%, N= 13). Negative opinions only formed 20% (N=4) and indifference was limited to 15% (3).

In contrast to the positive and convergent trends in the OAS study, the teachers polled in the Austin study showed a higher negative and divergent reaction to the use of Guaraní as an informal language. Although the majority (37.5, N=3) were in favor, a rather large percent, 25 (N=2) were opposed, leaving 37.5% (N=3) indicating indifference. These results contrast sharply with the reported use of Guaraní during recess (question #9), a supposedly informal situation in which only 25% (N=2) frequently used it, and 75% (N=6) infrequently used it. Overall positive reaction to Guaraní in the curriculum, as evidenced in the questions #17 (attitude toward Guaraní as a medium of instruction) and #21 (attitude toward Guaraní as a medium of instruction in specific subject areas), is surprisingly contradictory to the negative reaction to Guaraní as an informal language. Perhaps this question was misunderstood[52], or also possible is the implication that these teachers feel that Guaraní should have a greater role in the formal school setting, despite their unanimous report of infrequent use of Guaraní in question #15 (use of Guaraní during the year).

5.2 Results compared and contrasted: Attitudes toward the impact of the use of Guaraní (In teaching/learning)

In the OAS and Austin surveys, teachers were asked to give their opinions on whether the use of Guaraní facilitated or negatively impacted on the teaching/learning process. These two questions[53] were posed in separate forms, each one requesting the respondent to indicate a "yes", "no", or "do not know" response. Responses that are consistent would have had to indicate "yes" on one and "no" on the other, vice versa, or respond the same way on both questions, that is "no".[54] On this item in the OAS study, 70% (N=14) were consistent in their opinion that Guaraní did facilitate teaching/learning process and did not produce negative effects. Yet on the positively phrased question, 25% (N=5) claimed that the use of Guaraní did not facilitate the process; while on the negatively-phrased question 30% (N=6) claimed that it did produce negative effects. Only 5% (N=1) declared not knowing whether Guaraní facilitated the process. It is interesting to note that when the question was phrased negatively all respondents chose either a "yes" or "no" response; no one claimed not to know.

The respondents to questions #19, and #20 in the Austin study were approximately as consistent as those in the OAS study. There was only one teacher whose response switched when the question was posed in the negative. Thus, when the question was posed in the positive 75% (N=6) agreed that the use of Guaraní did facilitate the learning/teaching process, while 62.5% (N=5) declared that Guaraní did not have negative impact upon the process. The 25% (N=2) who claimed that Guaraní did not facilitate the teaching/learning process were joined by the addition 12.5% (N=1) when the question was posed in the negative, indicating that Guaraní did have a negative effect on the process (37.5%). Hence when the question is posed in the negative, unsure respondents in both studies switched their opinion, in the OAS study from "not knowing" to "yes" on the negative effect, and in the Austin study from "yes" Guaraní does facilitate, to "yes" Guaraní has a negative impact on the teaching/learning process.

Verón approached the topic of attitudes toward Guaraní by asking to what extent the respondents found Guaraní useful. The majority (51%, N=44.37?) reported Guaraní as very useful. Next, 23% (N=20.01?) indicated that it was a little useful; 11% (N=9.57?) found using Guaraní to be very little useful. Those that reported that Guaraní was of no utility composed 13% (N=11.31?), while those who did not answer consisted of 2% (N=1.74?).

The three studies thus indicate that the majority of the instructors favor using Guaraní because it is useful in the teaching/learning process.

5.3 Results compared and contrasted: Attitudes toward the impact of the use of Guaraní (On achievement)

Teachers were asked to express their opinions on the effect of the use of Guaraní on academic achievement. In the OAS study, this

question[55] evoked the highest "do not know" response rate (30%). Perhaps the teachers did not want to risk voicing their opinions on a question which they perceived to be empirically established, and outside of their knowledge. The group expressing the opinion that Guaraní does facilitate achievement was composed of 30% (N=6), while those who disagreed consisted of a slightly higher percentage (40%, N=8). However when the question was expressed in the inverse[56], the "do not know' responses remained stable (30%, N=6), the opinion that Guaraní does not facilitate achievement rose 5% to a total of 45% (N=9) and the opinion that Guaraní does facilitate dropped to 25% (N=5). Again we are witness to the effects of negative phrasing on the unsure segment of the respondents. These results contradict the high positive attitude expressed in the questions dealing with the role of Guaraní in the teaching/learning process.

In the Austin study, questions #22 and #23 ask for the information about Guaraní use facilitating or prejudicing the academic achievement. Again the negatively-phrased question provoked a switch in response from two respondents. In other words, in the positively-phrased question, 75% (N=6) agreed that Guaraní facilitated the academic achievement, and 25% (N=2) claimed it did not. In the negatively-phrased question 87.5% (N=7) claimed that Guaraní did not prejudice the academic achievement, while only 12.5% (N=1) agreed that it did. Therefore the teacher who expressed negative response on the positive question, and a negative on the negative question seems to be revealing that there is no Guaraní effect on achievement, or that she did not understand the question. On this question, teachers seem to confirm their positive reaction to Guaraní in the classroom, as expressed in earlier questions on the teaching/learning process.

In the Verón study the question on the impact of Guaraní was phrased in only one statement with which the teachers had to agree or disagree. The question asked the teachers to respond, according to their experience in teaching, if the students did not speak Guaraní, would they obtain better grades on the exams. The resounding response was 78% agreeing, 15% disagreeing, and 7% claiming not to know.

The three studies present a clear picture of changing attitudes towards the effect of Guaraní on school achievement throughout the past ten years. An initial uncertainty towards the effects of Guaraní on achievement in the OAS study was later followed by a growth in the number of opinions that Guaraní had negative effects (Veron's study). Almost ten years later in the Austin study, there is a clear indication that the majority view the effects of Guaraní as positive, and at least not harming the student's achievement.

6.0 Impact of the research team and equipment on teachers and students

The teachers responding to the OAS and the Verón studies were not asked about the effect of the respective researchers' presence on the teachers or students under observation. In contrast, this question was asked of the teachers in the Austin study. The unanimous response was that there was no negative effect of the research team on the teachers. However, 12.5% mentioned that there were some effects produced on the students. This respondent indicated that at the beginning the students were very curious about the equipment and were distracted from class work. According to this respondent, later, the students became more accustomed to the presence of the equipment and were not distracted. This feedback was useful in the interpretation of the data gathered in the observation section of this study. It allowed the researcher to discount certain observed behaviors which had arisen because of the his/her presence and which were not naturally occurring phenomena in the absence of the researcher. In OAS and Verón observation data, both gathered with the Flanders system of observation, no adjustment or recognition of research effect on the results were noted. Neither were teachers invited to comment on their reactions to the study.

7.0 Conclusion - trends and ambiguities

An examination of the results of these studies on teacher attitudes provides confirmation of certain attitudinal trends across time and indicates the areas of continued ambiguity. There seems to be a growth of positive attitudes which is not in terms of Guaraní language loyalty for sentimental reasons, rather for instrumental use in the educational setting. Guaraní still is very much an active part of the linguistic repertoire of the teachers at home and at school. Notwithstanding, there is continued stigma over the use of Guaraní in subject areas where written Guaraní would be necessary. At the same time, there is continued high esteem for Spanish in the same environment and a high rate of reported use. The results show that despite the growth in positive attitudes toward using Guaraní in the school site, and at the same time continued high esteem for Spanish, teachers do not report an increase in their use of Guaraní. In fact, the frequency of Spanish use alone has remained higher than the use of Guaraní alone throughout this period. The greater trend is toward reporting higher bilingual use. Finally, there is evidence of a continued need for teacher language training.

The ambiguities that are evident deal with teacher awareness of language use and choice. The findings indicate that there is mixed awareness about frequency of language use in the classroom over the course of the year. There is also a mixed level of understanding of language use and language selection in the teaching/learning process. Teachers in the studies tended to express lower frequency of Guaraní use, while maintaining consistently high reports of Spanish. This posture was held despite the equally consistent high regard for the utility of Guaraní in teaching/learning process.

7.1 Educational Implications

This study helps dispel several folk beliefs in education. First, those who blame mother tongue loyalties for endangering positive attitudes toward the second language are provided with evidence to the contrary. In the Paraguayan case, Spanish (the second language for most rural inhabitants) continues to be highly regarded and used with Guaraní (the mother tongue for most rural inhabitants). Second, those who claim that positive language attitudes translate into continued use of the mother tongue are not entirely correct either. At the same time teachers are transmitting prevalent personal and societal values, they are also held accountable for meeting the curricular goals. Thus, when societal norms and curricular goals do not converge, teachers may hold attitudes that are contradictory and that may be expressed inconsistently throughout the curriculum. As has been demonstrated in the Paraguayan case, the teacher's language attitudes are not necessarily reflected in the use of either Guaraní or Spanish. Finally in dispelling some of these beliefs, bilingual educators can recognize the possibility of incongruence between their own language attitudes and language use. Such mixed messages may have significant repercussions on levels of student bilingualism and/or achievement.

The results show that there has been growth in positive attitudes toward using Guaraní in the school site, and at the same time continued high esteem for Spanish. Not withstanding the high positive ratings for Guaraní, the use rate has not risen. In fact, the frequency of Spanish use alone has remained higher than the use of Guaraní alone throughout this period. Also bilingualism has continued to be prevalent.

8.0 Issues and Questions: Self-Report Surveys

Self-report studies are riddled with problems. Oller and Perkins (1978)[57] identify several problems arising in tapping attitudes. Raters anticipate the expectations of the tester, present flattering self-images, and respond without reflecting on the item probed. Degrees of understanding the question and the suspected potential use of the information gathered may interfere with the rater providing an accurate assessment. Response to the questionnaire may not be expressing the underlying attitude, rather a justification or an expression of what can be remembered and/or admitted. Other problems may arise because of the rater's suspicions about the researchers motives or purpose.

Self-reports involving reflection on language use, in general, are hard to validate unless some means of observation is employed, and/or unless teachers are conscious of and remember (or record) all the details of their language behavior (with whom, for how long, about what, where, etc.). Insecurities about the use of

stigmatized languages or forms may cause raters to deny use.

The rater's familiarity with the instrument may also affect the accurate recording of their attitudes. The ease with which the rater can respond is critical, especially in cases where experience with such instruments have been limited.

Also the site at which the survey is administered may affect the type of language reported. This is clear from the sociolinguistic research on language variation. Additionally, the site selection may determine whether or not cooperation is obtained from the rater or the authorities at the site.

The task to sort out the ambiguities and trends in the data requires a re-examination of the percentages in terms of the relationships between the items and the response patterns. The results obtained from survey questionnaires on language use need to be compared for convergence/divergence with the results of other measures. In this way, steps can be taken to portray more accurately the patterns of language use and attitudes toward that use.

In the Paraguayan context, several factors place limitations on research, and this type of research in particular. Having a restricted criteria for sample selection, in an area where the population size is reduced, serves to remove the anonymity of the respondent. Fear of reprisals could have been a factor prohibiting the respondents from answering more frankly. Also because there is general lack of contact with questionnaires for research rather than for political purposes,[58] some may have had suspicions about the purposes for which the results were being obtained. Unfamiliarity on the part of the rural teachers with even the simplified protocols, could have precluded the use of Likert scales. Thus, ease of administration seemed to have been a major research concern.

8.1 Issues and Questions:Possible artifacts of the questionnaire

Interpretation of the OAS report was very problematic. The study itself reports a high incidence of teachers answering positively to the questions asked regardless of the nature of the question. In other cases, where questions appeared to ask a "known" or "knowable" response, unsure teachers responded as if the questions were axiomatic, not pragmatic. Response bias could also have caused respondents to consistently mark the same choice of answers without seriously reflecting on the answer. It is also possible that the interpretation of the results may well be a mere artifact of the formulation of the questions, as seen in the cases where the negatively-phrased questions tended to skew opinions.

Verón reported that teachers in rural areas were more willing to collaborate with the study than were those that came from more

urban areas. Yet, Verón did not speculate on how this may have affected the results that were obtained. No information was presented on the rate of no response to the entire questionnaire (i.e. the teachers who were asked to participate and who choose not to) or the items that went unanswered on the questionnaire.

Austin's work had counted on the collaboration of all the teachers; however, not all answered the entire questionnaire. The 2 of the 5 unanswered questions dealt with teacher background, an issue which might have been a sensitive topic for particular instructors. Three other unanswered questions were from the same instructor. Unfortunately, the reasons for not answering these were not obtained.

8.2 Issues and Questions: Value of percentages

One issue in assessing results from case studies with low numbers of respondents concerns the value in using of percentages. Descriptive studies are limited to interpreting the significance of reported frequency of data under study. However, the criteria for "significance" of the responses needs to be considered. For the most part, the only appropriate measure of central tendencies for nominal data is the highest attained percentage. For example, in the OAS's teacher questionnaire discussion section, responses to ten items were included only from the categories "frequently" and "yes", excluding both the discussion of the negative, indifferent, "no response" answers; moreover, other items on the survey were not presented or discussed. No clear reasons were given to exclude these data. Although Verón's and Austin's studies also used percentages to report the responses, both included discussion of the results in terms of the importance of the majority of responses versus less significant responses.

However, Austin also cross-tabulated responses of the eight individual respondents according to various items: grade, training, experience, etc.. This was done to see whether or not respondents were consistently reporting their opinions, and to note whether or not response trends had any internal relation to each other. For such a small number of respondents, the ratings were relatively consistent within individuals. Certain relationships did show up between the items, which could be starting points for a hypothesis about teacher characteristics particular to the Paraguayan system. Therefore, the practical significance of the responses need to be viewed by taking another step: assessing the data to verify convergence or divergence of responses on the individual or group level.

Another issue that must be discussed concerns the manner of reporting response percentages in the teacher survey. The entire number of OAS participants was 80, 20 of whose results represented

the same zone reported on in the Austin study. The twenty respondents' answers were not identified according to which area (urban or rural) they belonged, rather they were merged into one group representing the zone. Verón adapted this strategy as well. The urban/rural distinction perhaps threatened the anonymity of the respondents, given the close circles of acquaintances and limited number of teachers. It may have also been an artificial distinction, given that most of the country can be identified better in degrees of rural characteristics, rather than in a dichotomous urban/rural distinction. Nonetheless, the distinction would have shed greater light on the actual variation in rural/urban language use patterns and attitudes. The responses thus appear to be more homogeneous than actually they could have been had the rural /urban distinction been retained in the reports.

8.3 Issues and Questions: Multiple measures and their convergence or divergence

In addition to the teacher questionnaire, all three reports included an observational study. Nonetheless, in the OAS and Verón studies, discrepancies between the teacher reported behavior and the observations were neither reported nor discussed.
In the Austin study, classroom interaction was taped at the beginning, middle, and end of the school year. These tapes demonstrate that Guaraní indeed was used frequently at the beginning. However, the reports of decline in usage as the year progressed were by far not confirmed. Several teachers who claimed to have used Guaraní frequently at the beginning of the year were actually teachers with infrequent use of Guaraní at the beginning of the school year, who, as the year progressed, did not increase rather maintained the same levels or slightly decreased the usage. One teacher that claimed to have infrequently used Guaraní in the beginning, actually used Guaraní very frequently throughout the school year. Hence, when empirical evidence was compared with self-reports in this study, at least with the average instructor, the self-reports are highly suspect at best and very inaccurate at worst.

The dilemma that this presents is common to all self-report studies. The issue of discrepancy between the voiced opinion or the reported behavior and the observed behavior is analogous to the discrepancy between espousing society-sanctioned ideals/norms and individual practice. Since potential incongruence must be expected, the contribution that attitudinal measures can make may well lie in identifying indicators of societal norms or the conscious psychological reality of the participants rather than an observable discrete behavior.

Thus while viewing behaviors, we may see a picture of what is sanctioned for the context, but not necessarily a reflection of the attitudes held. This conflict has been shown in language attitude research in the US among hispanic professionals with respect to

variables such as structural assimilation/integration, ethnic identity, and political consciousness.[59]

9.0 Potential areas for further research

Results from case studies rarely are generalizable to the whole population, yet we have seen some surprising stability across different case studies in Paraguay's case. Although this stability may well reflect the constant prevailing societal values, we are given historical indicators about acceptable linguistic behavior and attitudes in a bilingual country. What is needed is to measure the strength of these trends.

9.1 Potential areas for further research: U.S. bilingual teachers

For schooling purposes, it is important to determine how linguistic input provided to the students, shape their development as bilinguals. There are many questions that remain to be answered. In the US, what is our situation here? What teacher attitudes are expressed toward teacher use of the L1 and L2 in the class and are these affecting the actual teacher use of L1 and L2? Is bilingual education failing or progressing because of the language use patterns in the classroom? Who's minding the class? What attitudes do the teachers have toward the mother tongue, the L2? Do they model these? What kind of bilingualism are they promoting through their own language use?

Programmatic differences between bilingual education projects, eg. transitional, maintenance, dual, as well as federal regulations on exiting students from bilingual programs[1], and teacher qualifications: bilingual proficiency, second language training, certificated or teacher aide instructed make looking at this issue difficult to study here in the US. Nonetheless case studies can provide the ground-breaking work in these areas.

9.2 Potential areas for further research: Student awareness/perception of these teacher held attitudes

Questions on teacher attitudes should also take into account the student perspective. Are students aware of the language use patterns in their own classes? Are they subtlety or not so subtlety being trained to become monolinguals (as demonstrated by trends in

---

[1]. Federal Register, August 5,1980 stipulated bilingual instruction is no longer required when the student is no longer a limited english proficient, or once having been in a bilingual instruction program for two years and having reached comparable proficiency in English as in L1, or having scored at or above the 30th percentile in an English proficiency measure, or having been in a bilingual program for five years.

reported language use in the US 1980 national census), or closet bilinguals? Are there metamessages that shape student's attitudes toward their own usage of the two languages?

To begin to answer these questions, there is a dire need to examine more closely who is teaching in the bilingual class and how they use the valuable bilingual resources at their disposal. It is hoped that by examining the above mentioned factors, all educators can become aware of and take measures to control negative language attitudes that may be transmitted by their language use. And equally important, educators would then recognize attitudes and language use patterns that will encourage, not restrict, bilingual language development.

ENDNOTES

1.Rosenthal, R., and Jacobson, L. Pygmalion in the classroom. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston,1968.

2. Braun, C. Teacher expectation: Sociopsychological dynamics. Review of Educational Research, 1976,46,185-213.

3. Labov, W. The social stratification of English in New York City. Washington, D.C.: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1966. Also see Labov, W. Sociolinguistic Patterns. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1972.

4. Shuy, R.W. Sociolinguistics and teacher attitudes in a southern school system. In D.M. Smith & R.W. Shuy (Eds.) Sociolinguistics in a Cross-Cultural Analysis (pp.67-82). Washington,D.C.: Georgetown University Press.

5. Fishman, Joshua A. (1975). Language attitudes, International Journal of the Sociology of Language,I, No.3, 1-14.

6. DeStefano, J.S. Language, the Learner and the School. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1978.

7. Gynan, Shaw Nicholas The Influence of Language Background on attitudes toward Native And Nonnative Spanish,p.33

8. Other variables under this category are: self-esteem, ego permeability, anxiety, risk taking, social distance, and motivation.

9. Rodriguez-Brown, F.V. & Bustelo, M. (1987). Attitudes and motivational factors in second language learning.(ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 288 354)

10. Acton, W. 1984. Affect in the "communicative" Classroom: A Model. In: On TESOL '84

11. Williams, Frederick, Hewitt, N. Hopper, R., Miller, L.M., Naremore, R.C. & Whitehead, J.L.et. al. Explorations of the Linguistic Attitudes of Teachers. Rowley:Newbury House Publishers, Inc. 1976. By latitude,the mean position of the best estimate for the whole subject population, and the average amount of space for the latitude of acceptance and the latitude of non-commitment and latitude of rejection formed concentric

circles.In this way the rater has the potential of indicating a response to all adjectives based on relevance, best related, not relevant, and uncommitted.

12. For those interested in recent work on attitudes toward standard Spanish and the vernacular, consult the work of F.Betancourt (1986),"Puerto Rican Spanish: Attitudes", ERIC, No.ED 269 985.

13. Hall. W. and Freedle, R. Culture and language: The Black American experience. Washington D.C.: Hemisphere Publication, 1975.

14. Stewart, W. "Urban Negro Speech: Sociolinguistic factors affecting English teaching." In R.Shuy (ed.) Social Dialects and Language Learning.Urbana, Ill: National Council of Teachers of English.1964

15. Williams, et al (1976) identified two dimensions upon which teachers differentiated pupil speech samples: confidence/eagerness, ethnicity/nonstandardness.

16. Rosenthal, R., and Jacobson, L. (1968). Pygmalion in the classroom: Teacher expectation and pupil's intellectual development. New York: Holt, Rinehart& Winston.

17. Good, T.L. and Brophy, J. 1973. Looking in classrooms. New York: Harper & Row.

18. Good,T.L. (1981). Teacher expectations and student perceptions: A decade of research. Educational Leadership, 38, 415-22.

19. Gere, A.R. and Smith, E. (1979). Attitudes, language and change. Urbana, Illinois: National Council of Teachers of English.
Offer a thorough examination of teacher language attitudes and steps to change negative attitudes held by teachers and the community.

20. Cazden, C. B. (1988). Classroom Discourse, The language of teaching and learning. Portsmouth, New Hampshire: Heinemann.

21. Bruck, Margaret, and Jeffery Shultz. "An Ethnographic Analysis of the Language Use Patterns of Bilingually Schooled Children," Working Papers on Bilingualism, No. 13 (May, 1977), 60-87

22. Bruck, M., Shultz, J. & Rodriguez-Brown, F.V. (1979). Assessing language use patterns in bilingual classrooms: an ethnographic analysis. In A.D. Cohen, M. Bruck & F.V. Rodriguez-Brown (eds.) 40-56.

23. According to USAID Project Impact Evaluation Report No. 46, released in June 1983,
"The Paraguayan economy has maintained an annual growth rate in excess of 10% since 1979, compared to 6.1 percent during the 1971-1975 period" (p.2)

24. Guaraní was recognized as a national language in the constitution put forth by the Colorado Party in 1967.

25. Research was even carried out on the feasibility of using Guaraní scripts for literacy development. This was done under the auspices of USAID in collaboration with the Paraguayan Ministry of Education in 1977. See Louisa Stark's Alphabets and National Policy: The Case of Guaraní in Robert Blakely (Ed.), Proceedings of the Southern Anthropological Society's 16th Annual Meeting, Fort Worth, Texas (1981), University of Georgia Press.pp 70-83.

26. The project went through planning stages in 1976. Actual implementation of a bilingual program began two years later and culminated in 1981. See Graziella Corvalán, Las actitudes del maestro y el uso de la primera lengua en la clase [Teacher attitudes and the use of the mother tongue in the classroom], Sociolinguistics, Vol. 14, No. 2, 1984, pp.16-19.

27. Programa Regional de Desarrollo Educativo, Organización de los Estados Americanos (1978). Algunos aspectos del rendimiento escolar relacionados con el bilingüismo [Several aspects of school achievement related to bilingualism]. Ediciones Macchi, Buenos Aires, Argentina.

28. This educational plan established six curriculum areas: language (oral, reading , and writing), science (arithmetic, geometry, natural sciences, social science, artistic education (elementary art, and music), health (hygiene, and physical education), and starting in the fourth grade agricultural education and home economics (farming integrated with natural sciences, home economic integrated with the rest of the previous areas) which were to be covered over the 180 days of instruction. Students were evaluated on achievement on tests at the end of the year.

29. It was the Ministry of Education's desire to have all schools adapt the 1973 Plan by 1986. The latter plan reorganizes the curriculum into the following categories: Vida Social y Comunicación, Matemáticas, Ciencias Naturales, Salud, Arte, Educación Física. Students are evaluated then not only on a series of tests, but on attendance, aptitude, attitude, conduct, etc.

30. Urban/rural was determined by the characteristic of being department capital, or municipalities or districts; or being in the rural areas of the department capitals, or districts. It must be noted that most of Paraguay is rural, and more than half of Paraguay's labor force is engaged in farming about 2% of the 157,000 square-mile national territory.

31. The dissertation was filed under the title: Bilinguisme et echec scolaire dans les écoles rurales du Paraguay, a travers les enseignants.[Bilingualism and school achievement in the rural schools of Paraguay, by means of the teacher]

32. Verón, V. (1982). La competencia linguística de los niños rurales y el bilingüismo paraguayo [Linguistic competence of rural children and Paraguayan bilingualism]. In G. Corvalán & Germán de Granda (Eds.), Sociedad y Lengua: Bilingüismo en el Paraguay, Centro Paraguayo de Estudios Sociológicos, Asunción, Paraguay 1982.

33. The rural distinction here is more limited than the OAS study. Only two distinctions were made: those rural schools that were in towns considered to be urban centers, and those that were in areas considered to be completely rural zones.

34. In 1970, only 20% of the rural primary schools offered six grades. Less than 18 percent of those entering first grade finished the sixth grade. (AID Project Impact Evaluation Report #46, June 1983, p.4)

35. The items dealt with professional training, teacher background years of teaching experience, opinions about educational burdens, identification of outside-classroom duties, lesson plans (types used and frequency of planning), language proficiency, language use patterns, previous sociolinguistic training, preferences for training, procedures for dealing with limited Spanish-speaking children, opinions about the role of the two languages in a variety of school settings, opinions about the relation of mother tongue usage to academic failure, and opinions about the reason for continued student absences. Additional items on teacher background were SES factors: marital status, number of children, level of education of spouse, monthly income, educational level of parents, sex and age of the teachers, and place of residence.

36. Austin, T. (1989). [Language and literacy acquisition in rural Paraguay]. Unpublished raw data.

37. This is used in relative terms. Specifically, it is successful with respect to Paraguayan standards for Paraguayan educational purposes.

38. This high rate can be directly attributed to the Ministry of Education's control over the teachers' participation in the studies.

39. In order to get an approximate N, the percentages reported by Verón are multiplied by the total number of participants (87). These are marked by "?" and result in fractions of responses, which indicate either that the original N was not 87 for each question, or that there was a miscalculation in the reported percentages.

40. OAS, Table 33.

41. OAS, Table 34.

42. OAS, Table 34.

43. This found on page 736, Footnote #5 of Verón's article.

24. Although this question indicates the earnest with which the teachers report the use of their training, observation studies also confirm that beginning teachers methodically instruct in much the same ways as they were taught. Thus, conformity in this area is not surprising for new teachers.

33. OAS, Table 35.

34. OAS, Table 36b.

35. OAS, p.154.

36. This lack of use of Guaraní to reflect solidarity contradicts Rubin's work on the domains of Spanish vis-a-vis Guaraní. Perhaps it reveals that language choice decisions are not as clear cut or as static as was previously conceived; ie. Spanish is not the restricted to rural school settings nor is Guaraní the only language of solidarity.

37. OAS, Table 36a.

38. OAS, Table 39.

39. OAS, Tables 38a,b,c.

40. OAS, Table 39

41. OAS, Table 40.

42. Also included in this study, is a question (p.761) asking for an explanation for not using Guaraní. Interestingly, 28% claim the children are already bilingual; 20% report that the school

should "Castellanizar"; 17.2% did not respond; 13% claimed the parents did not want them to; 11.4% declared there was not a problem; 10.3% claimed other motives which were not mentioned by the report.

43. OAS, Table 45a.

44. OAS, Table 45b.

45. OAS, Table 45c

46. OAS, Table 45d

47. OAS, Table 45e

48. OAS, Table 45f

49. OAS, Table 45g

50. OAS, Table 41

51. OAS, Table 42

52. The word "informal" has negative nuances in Guaraní. Since the survey was administered in Guaraní, it is possible that the teachers reacted to these nuances.

53. OAS, Table 43, and Table 44

54. An answer of "yes" on both questions is also possible; however, would prove meaningless unless given additional qualifying remarks. Whereas a double answer of "no" could indicate a zero effects on student learning attributed to Guaraní.

55. OAS, Table 46

56. OAS, Table 47

57. Oller, J. and Kyle Perkins (Eds.) 1978 Language in Education: Testing the Tests. Rowley, Massachusetts: Newbury House.

58. Teachers were often coerced into participating in political rallies, voting according to party lines, and encouraging other to do so as well.

59. See Hurtado, Aida and Gurin, Patricia (1987). Ethnic identity and Bilingualism Attitudes. Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences, 9, 1-18.